REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated January 12, 2005. Claims 1, 5-11, 15-21, and 25-30 are pending in this application. Reconsideration of this application in view of amendments and arguments presented here is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 4 of the office action, the Examiner objected to claim 1 because of an informality. The Examiner required correction of the recitation from "re-designating said source database" to "re-designating said second database." Applicant has amended Claim 1 to reflect that correction.

In paragraph 5 of the office action, claims 1, 5-8, 11, 15-18, 21, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as unpatentable over Boothby et al., in view of Kodama et al., and in view of King et al., and further in view of Boothby et al. Respectfully, Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection on the basis that a combination of four references to render the claimed invention obvious is unreasonable and improper. As stated in the Ruiz case (Ruiz v Chance Co. (CAFC 12/6/00) 57 USPQ2d 1161) "the relevant inquiry for determining the scope and content of the prior art is whether there is a reason, suggestion or motivation in the prior art or elsewhere that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references" (In re Rouffet, 149 F3d 1350, 1359; 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1459 (Fed Cir 1998). Prior art considerations of three or more references invariably raise the question of propriety. In such combinations, incompatibility of disclosed structures, foreign functions and objectives or departures from the claimed structures, as gaps in the art should reject the combination. There is no suggestion in any of the references that suggests the combination that the Examiner asserts here, simply with the benefit of hindsight.

Applicant's undersigned representative would like to expedite resolution of the present Application by soliciting a telephonic interview.

A further question involves the propriety of the reference combination. A further question involves the propriety of the reference combination. As stated in the Ruiz case (cited above) "the relevant inquiry for determining the scope and content of the prior art is whether there is a reason, suggestion or motivation in the prior art or elsewhere that would have led one

of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references" (In re Rouffet, 149 F3d 1350, 1359; 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1459 (Fed Cir 1998).

Prior art considerations of three or more references invariably raise the question of propriety. In such combinations, incompatibility of disclosed structures, foreign functions and objectives or departures from the claimed structures, as gaps in the art should reject the combination.

Respectfully submitted,
BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: June 30, 2005

By: /Reena Kuyper/
Reena Kuyper
Registration No. 33,830

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860